

REMARKS

In the Official Action of June 28, 2004, the Examiner required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121 among twenty-six allegedly distinct inventions, namely:

Species A, referring to Fig. 4, showing the operation of a monitor device in a first embodiment;

Species B, referring to Fig. 5, showing the structure of a monitor device in the first embodiment;

Species C, referring to Fig. 6, showing the structure of a video memory interface;

Species D, referring to Fig. 7, showing an address space of a frame memory;

Species E, referring to Figs. 8A, 8B, 9A, 9B, 9C, 10, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24A and 24B, showing a display of a display portion;

Species F, referring to Fig. 11, showing a process of a display control for the first embodiment;

Species G, referring to Fig. 12, showing a process of a display control for a second embodiment;

Species H, referring to Fig. 15, showing the operation of a monitor device according to a third embodiment;

Species I, referring to Fig. 16, showing the structure of a monitor device according to the third embodiment;

Species J, referring to Fig. 17, showing the structure of a picture process device;

Species K, referring to Figs. 19A and 19B, showing a move process of a file between personal computers;

Species L, referring to Fig. 20, showing a copy process of a file between personal computers;

Species M, referring to Fig. 25, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a first modification of the third embodiment;

Species N, referring to Fig. 26, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a second modification of the third embodiment;

Species O, referring to Fig. 27, showing the operation of a monitor device according to a fourth embodiment;

Species P, referring to Fig. 28, showing the structure of a monitor device according to the fourth embodiment;

Species Q, referring to Fig. 29, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a first modification of the fourth embodiment;

Species R, referring to Fig. 30, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a second modification of the fourth embodiment;

Species S, referring to Fig. 31, showing the operation of a monitor device according to a fifth embodiment;

Species T, referring to Fig. 32, showing the structure of a monitor device according to the fifth embodiment;

Species U, referring to Fig. 33, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a first modification of the fifth embodiment;

Species V, referring to Fig. 34, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a second modification of the fifth embodiment;

Species W, referring to Fig. 35, showing the operation of a monitor device according to a sixth embodiment;

Species X, referring to Fig. 36, showing the structure of a monitor device according to the sixth embodiment;

Species Y, referring to Fig. 37, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a first modification of the sixth embodiment; and

Species Z, referring to Fig. 38, showing the structure of a monitor device according to a second modification of the sixth embodiment.

The Examiner has contended that the inventions of Species A-Z are patentably distinct from one another.


In response to the election requirement, applicant hereby elects Species P for further prosecution in this application. Applicant submits that at least claims 10, 20, 30 and 40 read on the picture display device of Species P. Furthermore, claims 19, 29, 39 and 49 are method counterparts to claims 10, 20, 30 and 40, respectively, and include substantially the same limitations. Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 19, 29, 39 and 49 are properly examined together with claims 10, 20, 30 and 40. Finally, claims 11-18, 21-28, 31-38 and 41-48 depend from claims 10, 20, 30 and 40, respectively. Although at least some of these claims also read on the picture display device of Species P, applicant submits that all of these dependent claims are entitled to be examined together with the independent claims from which they depend.

In light of the present submission, examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed necessary for this response. However, if the Examiner believes a fee is due, he is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Robert B. Cohen
Registration No.: 32,768
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant